

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the present Amendment and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24-29 are pending. In the present Amendment, Claims 9, 13, 15 and 16 are currently amended and new Claim 29 is added. Support for the present Amendment can be found in the original specification, for example, at page 1, lines 15-19, at page 55, line 3 to page 57, line 25, and in Figures 13 and 14. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 9-16, 18, 21, 24, and 27-28 were rejected as unpatentable over Shropshire (International Publication No. WO 02/05981) in view of Alibozek (non-patent document titled "Smart Software Builds a Better Harness"), and further in view of Yamashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,750); and Claims 19, 22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek and Yamashita, and further in view of Ozaki (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,537).

Initially, it is noted that a minor informality is hereby corrected in the specification. This correction is believed to be consistent with Figure 14, and thus no new matter is added.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections and traverse these rejections, as discussed below.

The method for synthesis of a routing of a vehicle recited in Claim 9 is hereby amended to better clarify how the zones and the routing between them are divided, identified, and displayed. Specifically, Claim 9 recites "dividing the vehicle into a plurality of zones, each of the zones including service variants and calculator variants." Further, the first view "shows the valid routings between the zones without showing the service variants, the

calculating variants, and the valid routing within each of the zones between the service variants and the calculator variants.”

Accordingly, as can be seen in the exemplary embodiment shown in Figure 13, the vehicle Z23 is divided up into a plurality of zones in subscreen 1330. Further, a routing 1354 between zones 202 and 220 is displayed. However, the surface variants, the calculator variants, and the routing within each of these zones are not displayed.

From Figure 13, when one of the zones (for example, the left front door which is zone 230) is selected, the view shifts to a second view, an exemplary embodiment of which is shown in Figure 14. Figure 14 shows the service variants and calculator variants within the left front door zone, and the valid routing between these variants.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest every feature recited in amended Claim 9.

The Office Action, in section 7, cites the combination of Shropshire, Alibozek, and Yamashita to reject independent Claim 9. In the first paragraph on page 4, the Office Action relies on Alibozek as describing displaying the second view on the display. Further, in the last paragraph on page 4, the Office Action relies on Yamashita as describing the first view on the display. Specifically, the Office Action relies on Figure 3 of Yamashita as describing a plurality of zones in which a routing is not shown.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest “f) displaying, in a first view on a display screen of the computer, the plurality of zones into which the service variants and the calculator variants are grouped, wherein the first view includes a guide to indicate how the plurality of zones are situated relative to one another, the plurality of zones schematically represent a product for which the routing is synthesized, and the first view shows the valid routings between the zones without showing the service variants, the calculator variants, and the valid routing within each of the zones

between the service variants and the calculator variants; and g) displaying, in a second view on the display screen, the valid routing between the service variants and the calculator variants within a single zone that minimizes the mean of the single zone of the plurality of zones, and the second view is generated by selecting the single zone from the plurality of zones displayed in the first view,” as recited in amended Claim 9.

Instead, Figure 3 of Yamashita shows individual components, and does not show a plurality of zones that were divided from a vehicle. However, even assuming that the individual components shown in Figure 3 can be interpreted as a plurality of zones, it is noted that Figure 3 does not show a routing between the zones, without showing service variants, calculator variants, and valid routings within them.

Additionally, each of the components shown in Figure 3 of Yamashita do not further include service variants, calculator variants, and valid routings within them. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to display the routings shown in Alibozek when one of the individual components from Yamashita was selected.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination does not disclose or suggest every feature recited in independent Claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 9, and all claims dependent thereon, as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 15 and 16, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 9. Thus, it is also respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 15 and 16, and all claims dependent thereon, as unpatentable over Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 25, it is noted that these claims depend on independent Claims 9, 15, and 16, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the


reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 9, 15, and 16. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ozaki does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the combination of Shropshire in view of Alibozek, and further in view of Yamashita. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 19, 22, and 25 also be withdrawn.

New Claim 29 is added by the present Amendment. Support for new Claim 29 can be found in Figures 13 and 14, and their corresponding description. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added. Further, new Claim 29 is added to provide examples of the plurality of zones and the single zone. As new Claim 29 depends on independent Claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 29 patentably defines over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 9.

Consequently, in view of the present Amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Colin B. Harris
Registration No. 58,969